

Application No. 10/760,989

### REMARKS

Claims 1 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Quesnel (6,137,989). The Examiner avers that Quesnel teaches the system and method for correctly matching images to skew of sheets transported through a paper path of a printer as claimed including a pair of registration skew sensors 122 adapted to generate signals representative skew of a sheet passing thereunder, a controller 29 adapted to receive the signal from the pair or sensors 122 and to generate a corrective print signal as a function thereof so as to cause a corrected image to be placed onto a photoconductive surface 12 that matches the skewed image signals received from the pair of sensors 122 and to transfer the corrected image on the photoconductive surface 12 to the sheet 48 in proper registration of the sheet. Applicant takes exception to this characterization of Quesnel '989 and will point out hereinafter specifically how Quesnel '989 is deficient in teaching what Applicant has claimed. First, Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection and submits that there is no teaching in Quesnel '989 of matching images electronically to the **sensed skew** of sheets. As the Examiner can see from col. 5, line 64 through col. 6, lines 1 - 3, and col. 6, lines 29 – 34, Quesnel '989 is directed to adjusting the inboard – outboard "top edge" of an image on the photoreceptor by adjusting the signal for the ROS "start of scan". This has nothing to do with rotating an image electronically before it is placed onto a photoreceptor to match skew previously sensed in a sheet as Applicant claims. This distinction gives applicant the advantage over the prior art of enabling higher speed machines from one family of machines without major hardware modifications.

Secondly, Applicant claims at least a pair of **skew** sensors for measuring the **skew** of passing sheets. In contrast, sensors 122 in Quesnel '989 are used to measure **top edge (inboard – outboard) misregistration** and then the start of scan of a ROS is adjusted to compensate for the misregistration. Here again, there is no mention of rotating an image electronically as claimed by Applicant.

Thirdly, claims 1, 5 and 9 call for skew sensors that send signals representing the amount of skew in a sheet to a controller that in turn skews an image that is

Application No. 10/760,989

placed onto a photoreceptor to match the skew of the sheet. Applicant submits that this structure is not disclosed or contemplated by Quesnel '989. This is not surprising since Quesnel '989 is, in contrast, directed to correcting top edge misregistration by controlling start of scan time of a raster output scanner. Additionally, claim 9 calls for providing at least one sensor for use in measuring the velocity of a sheet passing thereunder. Where is the teaching in Quesnel '989 of using a velocity sensor in electronically skewing an image as claimed? Applicant submits there is none.

Fourthly, with respect to claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 13, where is the teaching in Quesnel '989 of the use of pre and post transfer skew sensors as input to a controller to accomplish image rotation before an image is placed onto a photoreceptor? Applicant submits that, here too, there is none and that the Examiner appears to be using hindsight and Applicant's disclosure to try and meet Applicant's claims, which is not permitted under patent law. It is submitted that the sensors 122 are not skew sensors as claimed by applicant, but are simply inboard – outboard sensors for measuring the “top edge” of sheets as they pass thereunder. For all of the reasons mentioned heretofore, Applicant submits that all of the claims as presently presented are patentable over the prior art of record and an early allowance of the claims is requested.


The citing of the references to Stevenson, Yamanobe et al., Watanabe and Seto et al. is hereby acknowledged and Applicant agrees with the Examiner in that while they are pertinent to the present invention, they in no way anticipate or make Applicant's invention as claimed obvious.

Application No. 10/760,989

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

A telephone interview is respectfully requested at the number listed below prior to any further Office Action, i.e., if the Examiner has any remaining questions or issues to address after this paper. The undersigned will be happy to discuss any further Examiner-proposed amendments as may be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,



William A. Henry, II  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,403  
Telephone (585) 385-3798

WAH/gmm